



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

20  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/649,254	08/28/2000	Roger W. Sprague	Ms150961.1	6746
27195	7590	02/13/2004	EXAMINER	
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			PAULA, CESAR B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	4
DATE MAILED: 02/13/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/649,254	SPRAGUE ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> CESAR B PAULA	<b>Art Unit</b> 2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### **Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2002.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-50 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) 8-9 is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 28 August 2000 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ .  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2-3. 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_ .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the application, and IDSs filed on 8/28/2000, 4/13/2001, and 7/29/2002 respectively.

**This action is made Non-Final.**

2. Claims 1-50 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 21, 33, 39, 41, 43, 45, and 47-50 are independent claims.

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings filed on 8/28/2000 have been approved by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-2, 12, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kanevsky (Pat.# 6,300,947, 10/9/2001, filed 7/6/1998).

Regarding independent claim 1, Kanevsky discloses a client that accesses, and displays web pages—*data*— from a web page server. The client sends a request message to the server using a URL according to display characteristics of the client (col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 7-67).

Moreover, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays web pages, which have information and tags—*schema components*—on a window—*Interface* (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Kanevsky discloses a client that accesses, and displays web pages—*data component*—from a web page server. The web pages contain news index—*data record*—having several topics—*data elements*—such as “Top Stories” (fig.6). The web pages, have tags—*schema components*—which describe how information is displayed on a screen. Tag “HR” —*schema component*— (fig.6, 508) includes the following components: “HR”—*Name component*— which is a name describing the tag, “LEFT” component —*Title component*— which is a title of the “ALIGN” component, a “WIDTH” component, an “ALIGN” component, a “SIZE” component—*Display component*— for displaying a component in certain size, and a number component “5”—*Type component*— for displaying a line thickness (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 7-67). The tag, which is formatted in HTML—*representation language*— is used to format, and display data in web pages according to the components in the tag.

Claim 12 is directed towards a method equivalent to the steps found in claim 2, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding independent claim 21, Kanevsky discloses a client that accesses, and displays web pages—*data*-- from a web page server. The client sends a request message to the server using a URL according to display characteristics of the client (col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 7-67).

Moreover, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the client URL request received by the server, the server creates web pages according to the characteristics of the client's display, and sends the web pages accesses to the client. The client then displays the web pages—*first response message*-- which have information and tags—*schema components*—(fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, col. 6, lines 4-67, and col. 7, lines 42-67).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3-7, 10-11, 13-20, and 22-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky, in view of Lemay et al, "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop Creating Commercial Webpages", Sams, 8/1996, chapter 14, and pp. 356-359.

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Kanevsky discloses the accessing and displaying of web pages, such as "Yahoo" from a server by a client's URL request (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *the first request message includes a record identifier, a record count identifier*. However Lemay teaches the inputting, by a user, of a multiple product order information from more than one web page (subsequent request messages). The order has among other things: item no.—*record identifier*—, and the quantity of items ordered—*record count identifier*— (page 269, lines 20-29, page 276-279, 294, lines 24-29-page 295, line 4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 3, Kanevsky discloses a client that accesses, and displays HTML—*representation language*— web pages—*data component*—from a web page server. The web pages contain news index—*data record*—having several topics—*data elements*—such as "Top Stories" (fig.6). The web pages have tags—*schema components*—which describe how information is displayed on a screen. Tag "HR" —*schema component*— (fig.6, 508) includes the following components: "HR"—*Name component*— which is a name describing

the tag, “LEFT” component —*Title component*— which is a title of the “ALIGN” component, a “WIDTH” component, an “ALIGN” component, a “SIZE” component—*Display component*— for displaying a component in certain size, and a number component “5”—*Type component*— for displaying a line thickness (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 7-67). The tag, which is formatted in HTML—*representation language*-- is used to format, and display data in web pages according to the components in the tag.

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 4, Kanevsky discloses a client that accesses, and displays web pages—*data component*—from a web page server. The web pages contain news index—*data record*—having several topics—*data elements*—such as “Top Stories” (fig.6). The web pages, have tags—*schema components*—which describe how information is displayed on a screen. Tag “HR” —*schema component*— (fig.6, 508) includes the following components: “HR”—*Name component*-- which is a name describing the tag, “LEFT” component —*Title component*— which is a title of the “ALIGN” component, a “WIDTH” component, an “ALIGN” component, a “SIZE” component—*Display component*— for displaying a component in certain size, and a number component “5”—*Type component*— for displaying a line thickness (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 7-67). The tag, which is formatted in HTML—*representation language*-- is used to format, and display data in web pages according to the components in the tag. Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *the record count identifier comprises an integer representing a number records desired from the data source; wherein the data component comprises an integer number of data records having at least one data element, the integer number being equal to the record count identifier*. However, Lemay teaches the creation of a

confirmation web page after a customer has checked out a number of items ordered-- *record count identifier comprises an integer representing a number records desired from the data source*-- which includes an integer list of the items ordered-- *data component comprises an integer number of data records having at least one data element*, and their respective quantities as indicated by the user (page 269, lines 20-29, page 297, lines 23- page 299, fig. 15.4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27). This provides the benefit of having a web page confirmation page with all charges incurred in the product order, for later consultation.

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 5, Kanevsky discloses a client that accesses, and displays HTML—*representation language*-- web pages from a web page server (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 7-67).

Claim 7 is directed towards a method equivalent to the steps found in claim 6, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 10-11 are directed towards a method equivalent to the steps found in claim 9, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 10, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays web pages, such as those from the “Yahoo” website (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *the data component of the subsequent response message is empty and wherein the subsequent response message further comprises an error component including error information, further comprising creating an error event according to the error component.* However, Lemay teaches the display of a “failed.htm” web page, which indicates that an attempt to pay has failed—*response message is empty*—which entails that the user will not be able to receive the ordered items. The web page presents the user a message suggesting to try again by reloading the submitted web page, and by providing an alternative means of payment — *error component including error information* (page 292, item 8, fig. 15.3-4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27). This also provides the benefit of communicating with the user the fact that an order cannot be processed, and for the need to try again.

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 1, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays web pages, such as those from the “Yahoo” website (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *a presentation language representation of at least a portion of the error information from the error component to the interface.* However, Lemay teaches the display of a

“failed.htm” web page in HTML-- *presentation language representation of at least a portion of the error information*—which presents a message indicating that an attempt to pay has failed-- *response message is empty*—which entails that the user will not be able to receive the ordered items (page 292, item 8, fig. 15.3-4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27). This also provides the benefit of communicating with the user the fact that an order cannot be processed, and for the need to try again.

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 14, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays web pages, in HTML format, such as those from the “Yahoo” website (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, col. 6, lines 4-67, and col. 8, lines 16-34).

Claims 16-18 are directed towards a method equivalent to the steps found in claims 13-15 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 1, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays web pages, such as those from the “Yahoo” website (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *the data component is empty...rendering one of an end of form indicia and a beginning*

*of form indicia to the interface.* However, Lemay teaches the display of a web page for allowing customers to order music albums from more than one web pages. The web page has a form, which includes a heading with the web site's name-- *beginning of form indicia*--and a footer at the end of the page-- *end of form indicia*-- which has various links to various places in the web site (page 269, lines 20-31, fig. 14.5-6). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27). This also provides the benefit of communicating with the web site's administrators, and with the different features offered by the web site.

Regarding claim 20, which depends on claim 3, Kanevsky discloses that a client accesses, and displays web pages from the server as a result of a URL request, such as those performed with web pages' hypertext links, such as those from the "Yahoo" website (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, col. 6, lines 4-67, and col. 8, lines 16-34).

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 21, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays web pages, which have information and tags—*schema components* (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *the first request message includes an origin record identifier, and a record count identifier ...constructing the first response message having a schema component and a data component with data from the data source according to the origin*

*record identifier and the record count identifier.* However, Lemay teaches the inputting , by a user, of a multiple product order information from more than one web page (subsequent request messages). The order form has among other things: item no.—*origin record identifier*—, and the quantity of items ordered—*record count identifier*. As a result of the form being sent to a server, the server builds, and send an HTML, which has HTML tags—*schema component*— web page with a summary of the items ordered—*data component* (page 269, lines 20-29, page 276-279, page 297, lines 23-26, fig. 15.4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 22, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays web pages (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *constructing a query string according to the origin record identifier and the record count identifier, performing a query of the data source according to the query string, obtaining a result set from the data source.., and constructing the first response message according to the result set.* However, Lemay teaches the inputting of a product order information, by a user into a form. The order form has among other things: item no.—*origin record identifier*—, and the quantity of items ordered—*record count identifier*. As a result of the form being sent to a server, a server scripts determines the appropriate tax, and shipping fees in accordance to the ordered items. The fees are retrieved from a tax, and shipping database—*constructing and performing a query of the data*

*source according to the query string*—and the total tax and shipping charges retrieved from the database are included in a web page, which has a summary of the items ordered--*data component* (page 297, lines 14-26, page 298-299, fig. 15.4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27).

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 23, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays web pages, such as those from the “Yahoo” website (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *the first response message further includes an error component, including error information, further comprising creating an error event according to the error component.* However, Lemay teaches the display of a “failed.htm” web page, which indicates that an attempt to pay has failed-- *response message is empty*—which entails that the user will not be able to receive the ordered items. The web page presents the user a message suggesting to try again by reloading the submitted web page, and by providing an alternative means of payment — *error component including error information* (page 292, item 8, fig. 15.3-4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27). This also provides the benefit of communicating with the user the fact that an order cannot be processed, and for the need to try again.

Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 23, Kanevsky discloses a client that accesses, and displays web pages—*data component*—from a web page server. The web pages contain news index—*data record*—having several topics—*data elements*—such as “Top Stories” (fig.6). The web pages, have tags—*schema components*—which describe how information is displayed on a screen. Tag “HR” —*schema component*— (fig.6, 508) includes the following components: “HR”—*Name component*— which is a name describing the tag, “LEFT” component —*Title component*— which is a title of the “ALIGN” component, a “WIDTH” component, an “ALIGN” component, a “SIZE” component—*Display component*— for displaying a component in certain size, and a number component “5”—*Type component*— for displaying a line thickness (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 7-67). The tag, which is formatted in HTML—*representation language*— is used to format, and display data in web pages according to the components in the tag. Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *constructing the data component having at least one data record from the result set with at least one data element associated therewith*. However, Lemay the display on a browser of a confirmation web page, having a list of ordered items, and the appropriate tax, and shipping fees—*data record from the result set*— in accordance to the ordered items. The fees are retrieved from a tax, and shipping database (page 297, lines 14-26, page 298-299, fig. 15.4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27). This would also

provide the benefit of formatting the confirmation page in accordance with the retrieved database information, and the HTML tags in the web pages.

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 23, discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays web pages, such as those from the “Yahoo” website (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *determining an integer according to the record count identifier; constructing the data component having a number of data records in the data component equal to the integer if the integer is non-zero.* However, Lemay teaches the creation of a confirmation web page after a customer has checked out a number of items ordered--*an integer according to the record count identifier* -- which includes an integer list of the items ordered, and their respective quantities as indicated by the user (page 269, lines 20-29, page 297, lines 23- page 299, fig. 15.4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27). This provides the benefit of having a web page confirmation page with all charges incurred in the product order, for later consultation.

Moreover, Kanevsky, and Lemay fail to explicitly disclose: *constructing an empty data component if the integer is zero.* However, Lemay teaches the creation of a confirmation web page after a customer has checked out a number of items ordered which includes an integer list of the items ordered, and their respective quantities as indicated by the user (page 269, lines 20-

29, page 297, lines 23- page 299, fig. 15.4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay and construct an empty data component, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27). This provides the benefit of having a web page confirmation page indicating that nothing has been ordered-- *if the integer is zero.*

Moreover, Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *constructing an empty data component and constructing an error component having error information if an error condition exists.* However, Lemay teaches the display of a “failed.htm” web page in HTML which presents a message indicating that an attempt to pay has failed-- *empty data component and constructing an error component having error information*—(page 292, item 8, fig. 15.3-4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27). This also provides the benefit of communicating with the user the fact that an order cannot be processed, and for the need to try again.

Furthermore, Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *constructing an empty data component when an end of file or beginning of file condition exists.* However, Lemay teaches the display of an empty web page indicating that there are no items ordered-- *an end of file or beginning of file condition exists*-- or in a shopping basket (pages 280-281, fig. 14.7-9). It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27). This also provides the benefit of communicating with the user the status of ordered items.

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 21, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays multiple web pages (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, col. 6, lines 4-67, and col. 7, lines 16-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *the subsequent request message having a record identifier, and a record count identifier*. However, Lemay teaches the inputting , by a user, of a multiple product order information from more than one web page (subsequent request messages). The order has among other things: item no.—*record identifier*—, and the quantity of items ordered—*record count identifier*. A response web page is displayed the HTML formatted items description, and their respective quantities (page 269, lines 20-29, page 276-279, 294, lines 24-29-page 295, line 4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27).

Moreover, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of a URL request, the server sends the client the web page. The client receives, and displays web pages from the server, which have

information and tags—*schema components*—on a window (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67).

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 27, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays multiple web pages (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, col. 6, lines 4-67, and col. 7, lines 16-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *the subsequent request message having a data component from the data source according to the record identifier, record count identifier, and a direction identifier*. However, Lemay teaches the display of a multiple product order information confirmation notice from two different pages, by a user. The order has among other things: item no.—*record identifier*—, the quantity of items ordered—*record count identifier*—, and the description of the items ordered—*direction identifier*—which in effect informs the data provider of kind of items *direction*, in this case music, enjoyed by the customer (fig. 15.4, page 269, lines 20-29, page 276-279). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27).

Claim 29 is directed towards a method equivalent to the steps found in claim 23, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 30, which depends on claim 21, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays web pages (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *constructing the data component having at least one data record from the subsequent result set with at least one data element associated therewith*. However, Lemay teaches the creation of a confirmation web page after a customer has checked out ordered items, which includes tax, and shipping fees (flat or percentage)-- *data record from the subsequent result set with at least one data element associated therewith*--extracted from a database on a server (page 269, lines 20-29, page 297, lines 23- page 299, fig. 15.4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27). This provides the benefit of having a web page confirmation page with all charges incurred in the product order, for later consultation.

Regarding claim 31, which depends on claim 29, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays web pages (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *constructing an empty data component in the subsequent response message if an error condition exists according to the subsequent result set constructing an error component*. However, Lemay teaches the querying of a database as to the status of a product order. A web page report, which indicates if an order has been lost, misplaced, etc., is displayed to the user as a result of the query. The web page--

*constructing an error component--* contains the status of the order-- *empty data component--*, and not a confirmation of all the items bought as in fig. 15.4 (page 356, lines 10-page 358, fig. 18.7). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches ensuring that every order is promptly processed and shipped by quickly providing customers with order status (page 356, lines. 14-24).

Regarding claim 32, which depends on claim 29, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays web pages (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *the record count identifier is an integer, and wherein the data component of the subsequent response message comprises an integer number of data records equal to the record count identifier*. However, Lemay teaches the creation of a confirmation web page after a customer has checked out ordered items, which includes an integer list of the items ordered-- *data component of the subsequent response message comprises an integer number of data records*, and their respective quantities as indicated by the user (page 269, lines 20-29, page 297, lines 23- page 299, fig. 15.4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27). This provides the benefit of having a web page confirmation page with all charges incurred in the product order, for later consultation.

Regarding independent claim 33, Kanevsky discloses that a client accesses with a web browser—*Interface*—, and displays web pages from a web page server (col. 1, lines 57-67, col.4, lines 64-67, and col. 6, lines 7-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *the first request message having an origin record identifier, a record count identifier*. However Lemay teaches the inputting, by a user, of a multiple product order information from more than one web page (subsequent request messages). The order has among other things: item no.—*origin record identifier*—, and the quantity of items ordered—*record count identifier*— (page 269, lines 20-29, page 276-279, 294, lines 24-29-page 295, line 4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27).

Moreover, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the server sends the client the web pages, and the client displays those web pages, which have information—*data component*— and tags—*schema component*—on a browser window (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67).

Regarding claim 34, which depends on claim 33, Kanevsky discloses that a client accesses with a web browser, and displays web pages from a web page server. The web pages, which are formatted in HTML—*representation language*— display data in web pages according to the components in the tag (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, col. 6, lines 7-67, and col.8, lines 16-24).

Regarding claim 35, which depends on claim 34, Kanevsky discloses that a client accesses with a web browser, and displays web pages from a web page server. The web pages, which are formatted in HTML—*representation language*-- display data in web pages according to the components in the tag (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, col. 6, lines 7-67, and col.8, lines 16-24).

Regarding claim 36, which depends on claim 33, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of the URL request, the client accesses from the server, and displays web pages, which have information and tags—*schema components*—on a window--*Interface* (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67). Kanevsky fails to explicitly disclose: *send a subsequent request message having a record identifier, and a record count identifier*. However, Lemay teaches the inputting , by a user, of a multiple product order information from more than one web page (subsequent request messages). The order has among other things: item no.—*record identifier*—, the quantity of items ordered-- *record count identifier* (page 269, lines 20-29, page 276-279, 294, lines 24-29-page 295, line 4). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kanevsky, and Lemay, because Lemay teaches providing one of the easiest and most efficient ways of permitting customers to place orders of desired items (page 294, lines 24-27).

Moreover, Kanevsky discloses that as a result of a URL request, the server sends the client the web page. The client receives, and displays web pages from the server, which have information and tags—*schema components*—on a window (fig. 6-7, col. 1, lines 57-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67).

Claims 37-38 are directed towards a system equivalent to the system found in claims 34-35, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 39-42 are directed towards a data provider equivalent to the steps found in claims 22, 27, 3, and 27 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 43-46 are directed towards a computer-readable medium for executing the steps found in claims 3, 10, 22, and 27 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 47-50 are directed towards a data provider equivalent to the steps found in claims (22 and 27), 10, and 47-48 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 8-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Blinn et al. (Pat. # 6,484,150), Chen et al. (Pat. # 6,668,354), McCauley et al. (Pat. # 6,626,958), Hill et al. (Pat. # 6,023,714), and Yost et al. (Pat. # 6,260,050).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**



Cesar B Paula  
CESAR B PAULA  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2178

2/6/04